

be allowable. All remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 or Claim 17. Because Claims 1 and 17 are now allowable, it is submitted that the remaining claims are allowable as well.

As noted above, the Examiner had asserted that the amendment to claim 1 raised 35 U.S.C. §112 issues with respect to claims 11, 16, 26, 27 and 30 because those claims call for "further comprising" an aromatic hydrocarbon solvent, when claim 1 as now amended already calls for the solvent. Claim 30 does not include the language objected to. However, claim 31 depends from claim 26, which does contain the language and so it is believed that the reference to claim 30 was intended to be to claim 31. It is believed that the amendments to claims 11, 16, 26 and 31 obviate the concerns raised in the Advisory Action. Claims 11 and 26 have been amended to state that the aromatic hydrocarbon solvent is the organic solvent now called for in claim 1. Because the concerns raised with respect to claims 16, 27 and 31 resulted from their dependence from claim 11 or claim 26, the concerns with respect to claims 16, 27 and 31 are likewise believed to have been obviated. Claims 16 and 27 have been amended so that they no longer call for the lower limit of the aromatic hydrocarbon solvent to be 0%.

Accordingly, it is submitted the present amendment does not raise new issues and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Thus, favorable reconsideration and early allowance of the subject application and, in particular, Claims 1-37, 40 and 42-45, are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Solomon  
Reg. No. 31,427  
Howell & Haferkamp, L.C.  
7733 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 1400  
St. Louis, Missouri 63105  
(314) 727-5188

March 14, 2000